



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,153	12/06/2004	Lasse Wesseltft Mogensen	12706-9	5568

757 7590 03/09/2006

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER
----------

KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3763

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) that was submitted on 12/6/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

### ***Specification***

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds the 150-word maximum allowed and contains several legal terms ("said"). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification lacks the descriptive titles used in US applications ("Summary of invention, Brief description of drawings....etc).

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: The "...first and second end of the tubing..." is ambiguous, as seen in Figure 6 the tube ends are not present at all in the first and second end of the securing elements.

Claims 1-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: Examiner requests that the reference numerals be removed from the claim.

Claims 2 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: The use of the term "preceding claim" is ambiguous, please reference the claim intended. For the purpose of examination, Examiner will reference the previous numbered claim. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-19, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teissen-Simony (5,522,803) in view of Wilder et al. (4,606,735). Teissen-Simony meets the claim limitations as described above but does not include a second element for fixing the tubing as disclosed.

However, Wilder et al. teaches a medical tubing holder. Regarding claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12, 14, 21, and 25, Teissen-Simony discloses a cannula housing, cannula, and flexible tubing, all in fluid communication (Figure 1). Wilder et al. teaches a medical

Art Unit: 3763

tubing holder that comprises a first and second end (20,21) that is composed of a flexible material wherein parallel runs of tubing can be inserted in that the ends are displaced inward upon movement of the tubing (Figure 5). The tubing is movable as described in the disclosure to control tubing stress (Figure 4, col 2).

Regarding claims 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, and 22, Wilder et al. teaches the use of a holder mechanism that contains two bores (H1, H2) or guides that hold the tubing interiorly, have a means for preventing tube removal (Figure 5) and promotes holding on of the tubing with connection means (c).

Regarding claims 7, 16, 18, and 23, Teissen-Simony discloses a source coupling element (Figure 2) and Wilder et al. teaches the use of a tubing holding element with a source connection and a cannula connection (Figure 5, (c)).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the system of Teissen-Simony with the tubing holder of Wilder et al. because the addition of the tubing holder provides the assembly with the tube stress relief, tube extension control, and tubing support on the patient. Both references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Wilder et al.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teissen-Simony in view Wilder et al. in further view of White (5,643,216). Teissen-

Simony and Wilder et al. meet the claim limitations as described above but does not include three parallel courses of tubing.

However, White teaches a patient tubing bracelet. Regarding claims 9 and 20, White teaches the an IV tubing system that has three parallel tubing courses and is capable of creating several more courses through its guide and bore system (Figure 5).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the system of Teissen-Simony with the guide channels of White because the addition of the additional guide channels provides more precise tubing control and allows for several more tubing configurations for adaptability. Both references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of White.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-4:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2/23/06  
[Date]

  
Christopher Koharski  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3763

  
MICHAEL J. COOPER  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNICAL STAFF (EBC)